DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 292 455 IR 013 207

AUTHOR Braden, Roberts A.; Terrell, William R.
TITLE The Challenge from Within: Some Unpopular Views on Instructional Development Topics. Chapter 12.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 17p.; In: Instructional Development: The State of the Art. Volume I, 1978; See IR 013 196. For chapter 5, see ED 144 587.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Agents; *College Faculty; *College Instruction; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Instructional Development; *Instructional Improvement; Student Role

ABSTRACT

This chapter examines several aspects of the instructional development (ID) process as it occurs in higher education, and presents arguments: (1) in favor of using students in various aspects of the instructional development process; (2) in favor of "shotgunning" rather than taking on only large projects; and (3) against confusing instructional development with faculty development. Many of the well-established assumptions currently governing ID in higher education are questioned, and it is argued that reaching a consensus on the issues of instructional development is not as important as each instructional development program establishing its own priorities and enhancing its own public image. Finally, it is concluded that the nature of the impact of instructional development is not yet known, but that it will be determined by the issues examined in this chapter. A 15-item bibliography is provided. (Author/EW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED292455

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CHAPTER XII

THE CHALLENGE FROM WITHIN: SOME UNPOPULAR VIEWS ON INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT TOPICS

By
Roberts A. Braden
and
William R. Terrell

Is instructional development (ID) destined to be the salvation of formal education? Maybe, but probably not. There is even some doubt that ID will so much as make a lasting mark on the educational process. These are neither words of heresy nor a prophesy of doom. Rather, this is an analysis which attempts to speak to realities. Consider a critical element of evidence: after several years we perceive no signs of a significant movement to "develop" instruction. To the contrary – only a miniscule fraction of instruction at any level has received the benefit of systematic development (ID). Consider also the fact that there is no evidence of any national movement toward the promotion of ID. For example, the jury is still out on the Instructional Development Institute (IDI). IDI is a heavily funded national program for the promotion of instructional development. Sadly, after several years of activity, principally on the K–12 level, IDI has had little impact. It is a rare educator who has even heard the term. That raises a sticky question or two, such as, "Is it possible to bring about the kind of reform implied by ID when many people will not even admit there is a problem?" Or, if that question doesn't draw confused or conflicting answers, how about a question a bit below the belt, such as, "If the ID people are smart enough to be offering fancy solutions to problems, why can't they solve their own communication problem with the rest of the field of education?" Maybe these are questions without answers, but since each gives rise to some antisocial thoughts, we suspect that the questions merely lack agreed upon answers.

There are other questions concerning ID that do not yet have agreed-upon answers. That lack of agreement means controversy. Here, for example, are ten additional questions, guaranteed to draw frowns and scowls at any AECT/DID conference meeting. Ask any of these questions and watch your popularity plummet:

1. In understandable terms, what is Instructional Development? (Insist that the mumbo jumbo in the AECT Glossary needs to be re-phrased for you.)

IR013207

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
LeRoy Davenport
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2. What is included in the ID process?
   (Be sure you find out if anything on the list can be left out and if anything can be added.)
3. How can we best achieve impact through ID?
   (You might want to find out what impact really means in ID circles before asking this question.)
4. Can we really afford to have impact, or is cost effectiveness an integral part of impact?
   (The idea is to keep effectiveness, efficiency, and economics "up front" simultaneously until you learn what really counts.)
5. Why is it so difficult to utilize the concept of "individualization" in ID?
6. Who sets the goals of ID?
   (With a hat full of competing constituencies, this question has more disruptive punch than a small A-bomb.)
7. What are the goals of ID?
   (And how many angels can dance on the head of a pin?)
8. Who sets the priorities when some ID projects are selected and others rejected?
   (This question is obviously fraught with discrimination overtones and can be a question of equal opportunity for maximum effect.)
9. Who should do the work in an ID project?
   (Because everyone in academe believes he or she is overworked, try a variation of this question which lets it be known that the purpose of your question is to pass the buck.)
10. What is shotgunning?
    (Insist that exact guidelines are needed. Do not settle for a vague or general answer.)

Some of our readers who are familiar with any of several ID models will already have identified what we have done by setting forth the nasty questions. In "systems" parlance we have been busy doing needs assessment. We have been delineating the problem. By suggesting that our ultimate job is to *answer* these sticky questions we have started a task analysis. Because we know what we want to find out, our objectives beg to be specified in measurable terms.

How much further can we go following this systems metaphor? Well, we can consider our factual resources, weigh alternatives, and suggest strategies which, if adopted, would constitute a prototype of a real world ID model. What we can *not* do is eliminate the sticky questions one-by-one. The whole mess is far too interwoven. We find both divergence and unity in this situation. The issues are distinct but

not discreet. As a consequence, we will first present a passing notation of the clusters into which the questions tend to fall. Then the subject will be treated on a topical basis.

From looking at the kinds of questions about ID which need to be resolved, we find that they fall into the following areas: 1) Verbal Issues—the word problems, i.e., definitions, terminology and conceptual theory; 2) Impact Issues—issues related to the nature and degree of the impact of ID, including the controversial "shotgunning" issue; 3) Power and Policy Issues—the setting of priorities and the whole realm of restrictions to be placed on what ID is, how it functions, and who participates; and, 4) Procedural and Professional Issues—including the appropriate activities for diffusion of ID. The reader should not expect cohesive analyses of each of these issue clusters, *per se.* They, like the questions themselves, are so intricately interwoven that they cannot be separated. Although most current challenges to ID are to the verbal cluster, they almost inevitably involve the other three clusters too. For that reason, definition—the key to the word problems—needs to be the first topic discussed.

DEFINING INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The profession does not completely agree upon how it should define itself or its process. The lingering disagreements persist because definition is closely related to philosophical positions. Thus, opening this topic will help to illuminate the authors' philosophical perspective of ID. Much considered effort has gone into the problem of defining instructional development, and we offer three examples here. First, from the AECT Task Force on Definition and Terminology, we have the only "endorsed" definition:

> INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT: A systematic approach to the design, production, evaluation, and utilization of complete systems of instruction, including all appropriate components and a management pattern for using them; instructional development is larger than *instructional product development*, which is concerned with only isolated products, and is larger than *instructional design*, which is only one phase of instructional development. (AECT, 1977)

The emphasis of the AECT definition seems to be upon inclusiveness. It is explicit in the definition that instructional design alone cannot be counted as ID. Following that logic, any endeavor which failed to meet *all* of the requirements of the definition would be something other than ID. This is a completely rational approach at the definitional level with only one flaw—it defines us out of business. The inclusiveness of process functions—that is, rigorous adherence to process structure—is far and away the exception rather than the rule in the real ID programs of American colleges and universities. Most faculty clients don't want

the whole rigorous ball of wax. Similarly, many projects don't warrant absolute process rigor. It seems counter-productive to have a whole trunk full of definitions to cover each distinct contingency. All of which leads us to a second definition, offered here for contrast in terms of its simplicity:

> INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT: A goal-oriented, self-correcting process for the solution of instructional problems. (Braden, 1974)

Although the wording is brief, when this definition was first offered in 1973, the author found it necessary to load it with the following caveats:

> The process involves the use of a structured procedural model for the creation and/or revision of learning packages. The procedure provides for determination of objectives, application of systematic decision making, evaluation of outcomes, and introduction of feedback to facilitate revision. Implicit in the procedure is the consideration of current educational theory and technology in the identification of teaching-learning strategies and in the selection or production of instructional materials. Ideally, although the procedures are structured, neither the process nor the product is rigid—both being subject to the many forces which interact with the learning situation. (Braden, 1973)

When asked to respond to the above definition, Leslie P. Greenhill, from Pennsylvania State University, provided what might well be the best advice available on the subject, "I don't know why we bother to argue about what instructional development is or isn't. I just call what we do *instructional improvement* and let it go at that." Greenhill apparently vibrates on much the same frequency as Kent Gustafson who told the Philadelphia AECT convention that, "ID is . . . a process for improving the quality of instruction." (Davies and Schwen, 1972) This definition is at once simple and profound. We select this definition as being most operative in our philosophy of ID. Greenhill and Gustafson cut right to the heart of the matter. They offer a notion of ID that focuses upon instruction—the learning event—and thus the learner. They also, we believe, speak to the true goal of most instructional developers.

THE STRUGGLE FROM WITHIN

Instructional development faces many challenges—several from within. The advocates of "my way" have had destructive effects on the ID movement. They have subverted or at least set aside the need to promote ID in the educational world. Misguided advocacies and lack of accord on matters of definition and theory among leading figures in ID have at the least confused the issues and diverted attention from

diffusion of the ID concept. One example of how the instructional development movement has been confused is through the Identity Error, perpetrated by some advocates of faculty development. Specifically, Gaff (1975) mistakenly subsumes ID, a *student*-centered activity, under *faculty* renewal, obviously a *faculty*-centered activity. Several authors, but most notably Bergquist and Phillips (1975, 1977), redefine ID in a faculty development mold. Also, Popham (1974), who should know better, is the author of the following statement which we assume is an honest mistake of definition: "An instructional development program is the current euphemism used to describe an effort *to improve the teaching skills* of university faculty members." [emphasis added] Popham was referring to *faculty* development, and the rest of his incisive remarks on that topic are truly worth reading.

For a moment, consider a few basic truths and generalities. For instance, faulty theory or misguided policy can lead us into errors of execution. Worse, theorists sometimes become advocates, unable to gracefully accommodate counter-theory. Policy makers can fall into the same trap when the theory of the process or the sequence of goals becomes important enough to those individuals to excite their missionary zeal. Advocacy gets things done, but there is no guarantee that the most successful advocate is backing the best program or course of action. It might be well to translate the above generalizations into real world ID examples.

Perhaps the best known example of restrictive theoretical advocacy is the ID dogma, "thou shalt not shotgun" as advocated by Diamond, *et al.* (1975). This is viewed as a stifling restraint and as frequently inappropriate advice by some developers, including the present authors. Still another example may be found in the 1977 marching orders of AECT's Division of Instructional Development (DID).

The very first words Silber (1977 a) wrote as president of DID were, "One of DID's major goals is to help professionalize instructional development." Subsequently, Silber (1977 b) showed that this was his *first priority* by devoting the entire first DID column in *Audiovisual Instruction* to the subject "Professionalizing Instructional Development." This is a policy error and an error of priorities. Rather than deal with the critical issues involved in promoting ID within the educational community, the DID leadership addresses issues of professionalism and certification. It would seem that rational priorities would require addressing the need for promoting ID before creating the trade union. Why worry about licensing professionals for whom there is no demand? We must beware, lest the field be accused of saying, "where there is short demand, limit the number of professionals."

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT – INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

In addition to a definition of instructional development, a differentiating definition of faculty development is needed. An objective appraisal of the current situation will show that the faculty development movement has done much to obfuscate the ID message. Many people confuse the two. Let us state clearly, *Instructional Development and Faculty Development are not the same things.* We have identified ID. How about Faculty Development? Faculty Development is a bag full of disjointed parts. Some of the components of faculty development are unpalatable to vast numbers of college faculty, e.g. in-service workshops. Other aspects of Faculty Development are weak attempts at featherbedding, e.g. retraining professors from overpopulated disciplines into needed teaching areas. Indeed, some Faculty Development proposals are a mixture of whimsy, folly, and naivete, e.g. "personality development" and personal growth programs. However, it is not this unflattering picture of the bits and pieces of faculty development that is most troublesome. Rather, it is a concern that there is neither direction nor cohesion in the movement. Thus, the major objection to faculty development is that it is a fad in search of substance.

Gaff (1975, p. 47) has clearly demonstrated that he understands the nature of ID. Yet, he persists in forcing ID into a *faculty renewal* mold. Gaff (1975, p. 99) classes faculty development, instructional development, and organizational development as instructional improvement programs for the purpose of faculty renewal. It is easy to understand Gaff's purpose in writing about instructional development under the mantle of faculty renewal, but it is an area in which we should tread cautiously, armed with commonly accepted definitions and an understanding of our basic premises. At first blush, Gaff's position does not seem so far removed from the standard ID practice of spreading ID by turning faculty clients into instructional developers in their own right. Take heed! Before you buy the faculty renewal connection, examine carefully the transition in thought and purpose that is injected by the Gaff notions. Instructional development is being served up as a nostrum for the pedagogically ill faculty member. Suddenly ID's ultimate purpose is to serve or improve the faculty member. The skills of ID (as they can be given to faculty) have supplanted in importance the purpose of using the ID process. How different that seems from the original conception that ID, a process focused upon the solution of problems and the outcomes of student learning, might best be spread by teaching the teachers how to apply the techniques of the ID process by themselves.

There can only be encouragement for any program that seeks to improve faculty performance. We therefore must all applaud faculty development intentions. However, those of us who are practicing instructional developers and all of our champions must rise up in righteous indignation when – in the name of faculty development – the focus of instructional development is listed as "Individual faculty, Individual courses, [and] Curricula." (Bergquist and Phillips, 1975, 1977) What happened to *learning?* What happened to individual students as the final and most important point of focus?

The present authors assert the premises that: 1) ID must yet be sold to the educational community, and 2) ID is a student-centered activity. Both premises are threatened from within the ranks of instructional technology. Threat one: we must contend that too many missionaries of faculty development do ID a disservice in the area of communication. By building an association between faculty development, instructional development, and organizational development that confuses the educational community, these faculty advocates make it more difficult to promote ID. Threat two: such fads as faculty renewal/faculty development would turn the ID process away from student-centered concerns and toward more self-serving faculty concerns. We are all in favor of programs that improve the lot of the faculty, but not when they are at cross-purposes with true reform in education.

The thing that the two threats just mentioned have in common is that they each speak to the issue of impact. The first addresses the *degree* of impact – the second speaks to the *nature* of the impact. Impact is an issue which cannot be avoided in instructional development. All of the ID theorists and practitioners, with their many differences in style and philosophy, are concerned about impact. We may challenge their beliefs or their approaches in these pages or elsewhere; however, it should be noted that the desire to have a favorable impact unites them all into a select group of very worthy people.

SHOTGUNNING

Within the ranks of practicing instructional developers in higher education there are differing opinions about the best methods for achieving impact. The philosophical battle lines are most clearly in focus when the impact issue is discussed in terms of "shotgunning." Diamond (1975) speaks most eloquently and emphatically for the anti-shotgun school.

> Maximum support must be given to each project undertaken, with no more projects underway than can be adequately supported.

> The shotgun approach does not work. Projects should be selected to meet institutional priorities that have been established for their potential impact. Supporting a series of small and unrelated efforts may make a lot of friends for the staff of the center and keep them busy, but the total and lasting effects will be minimal. A series of partially developed courses can consume much time, energy, and budget, but will result in less viability and acceptance than one or two completed projects that are both successful and operational.

There are scores of instructional developers around the country who operate shotgun programs. They operate quietly, because no one speaks for them with the eloquence of a Diamond. It is almost a temptation to say that no one speaks for them at all, but that is not quite true. While their instincts and the imperatives of their environments have sustained this legion of shotgunners, a faint word here and there has been said on behalf of their practice.

Holsclaw (1975) has been helpful in providing us with comments from four well-known professional instructional technologists that favor shotgunning. Holsclaw quotes Dale Hamreus of U.S. International University as saying:

> Attack the need. – The important issue should be "What is the need?" then "What are the resources that can be brought to bear upon the need?" Don't be concerned about whether it is "shotgunning" or not "shotgunning".

San Jose's inestimable Jerrold Kemp was enticed into offering this marvelous piece of advice: "Start small – prove your worth." George Voegel, the forceful dean of W. R. Harper College, was perhaps more neutral with his comment, " 'shotgunning' gives a quick turnaround on a small scale." Finally, Northeastern's Thomas Cyrs advised, "Use little projects to get big projects."

The shotgunning dichotomy is real. There are shotgunners, and there are several large ID operations that shun small projects and have anti-shotgun policies. If these latter operations serve their host institutions well, then let us all say "bravo." But let us draw the line there. Bridges, Diamond, and others, who are fortunate enough to run these programs, and who advise that others should adopt their *modus operandi,* may have missed the notion that what works well at one institution can be inappropriate at another.

Because this is an area of controversy, it is important to insure that the terminology is clear. Much of the controversy lies in the lack of agreement about what is or is not included in the developer's role. Diamond (1975) uses the term "major academic redesign" to identify the domain in which his brand of instructional development takes place. It is difficult to fault his frame of reference:

> It should be emphasized that the process . . . is designed to generate lasting or long-term changes – major redesigns in courses and in academic procedures (registration, scheduling, credit formats), and the evolution of new programs and curricula. While many faculty do innovate within the confines of their classroom, and while many campuses give extensive support to these activities, this type of effort rarely extends beyond a single class or beyond the tenure of the particular teacher in a specific course. What those responsible for the improvement of instruction are after are major and lasting improvements that will have long-range impact on the institution in which they take place.

Diamond goes on to sharpen the focus of his logic with a quick caveat and a succinct identification of the critical issue of impact.

> The support given the individual faculty member, while important for the climate of the campus and for the instruction within a single classroom, rarely solves major problems or effects institutionwide changes, and must be considered accordingly. Unless projects are selected for their relationship to the needs of the institution and their prognosis for durability once implemented, there will not be impact.

While the present authors agree that major academic redesign projects are important, they most emphatically insist that individual faculty projects are at least equally important. That, of course, is the essence of the controversy. Maybe an example would be helpful:

At Hypothetical U., the English department offers an introductory course, Comp. 101, as a service course to the university. All freshmen are required to take the course. There are 90 sections of Comp. 101, taught by 30 low ranking faculty and graduate assistants. All English faculty with any power base whatsoever are teaching courses other than Comp. 101. The 30 drones who have the onerous task of "teaching the freshmen to write" would all rather discuss lyric poetry than comma splices. The potential for "impact" from redesigning just one course, Comp. 101, is tremendous. Right? Wrong! Not under the circumstances described. There is no climate for lasting change. The change can be *imposed,* but it will fall far short of expectations unless there is a faculty demand for the change.

Continuing with our example, there is a mathematics professor at Hypothetical U. who wants to design a self-instructional course in modern number theory, Math 481, to serve four or five math majors each semester (the course is now taught on alternate years, and only if ten students can be scraped up who need and can handle the course.) The potential for impact is so low that no ID help should be offered to this

professor. Right? Wrong! How can we deny any student the opportunity to take what may be a capstone course in his field on the basis of inadequate demand, and how can we penalize those faculty who teach the most esoteric subjects by withholding support from them simply because only a few students ever reach high enough to need their knowledge?

At this point we can bring our example to a head: Assume the chairman of the English department is willing to work with the ID office in preparing a tightly structured course to be "managed" by the 30 drones. There are no other potential clients at the moment – just the Math professor and the English chairman. What do you do? Our answer is to shotgun. Take both clients. The English situation needs to be slow rolled so that time will be an ally in delivering faculty support. The math situation needs to be expedited so that the enthusiasm of this key faculty member can be fully exploited.

The example can be expanded to include redesigning a sophomore level class that attracts 30 students per semester. Unlike the Math example, no student need miss out on this instruction, but the faculty member who teaches it thinks it can be done better. Should he be supported? We think so. Consider the *negative impact* if he is not. In many ways the faculty member is the most important member of the ID team. He must be wooed, cajoled, and pampered, because his reputation and expertise are essential to the credibility of the ID product, whatever it might be. No ID operation, however well entrenched, can afford to reject or otherwise offend any faculty member.

The big secret about ID is that it can be done by the faculty member *without* the instructional developer. There! We said it. You have just been offered ID's first unspeakable fact. But that's not all. No ID operation anywhere can more than *begin* to do the job (unspeakable fact number 2). Look at the catalog of any college of even modest size. How many courses are offered? Hundreds? At large universities the offerings exceed a thousand or two. Diamond (p. 23) suggests that a developer can work on four major projects at once. His estimate is good enough. Assume only 400 courses. (Too few.) Assume each can be redesigned in a semester. (It takes longer.) One developer can work through the entire curriculum in only a half century – and eight of those courses will be up-to-date every year!

The anti-shotgunners stress major and lasting impact. They claim a few major projects will have greater impact than several small ones. This is not necessarily true. A few major projects each year will touch very few students who are not enrolled in the chosen areas. Worse, a few major projects each year will touch only a few faculty – even though each faculty member "touched" can be expected to reach *many*

students every year for many years. Successful instructional development should result in the training of the faculty/client to employ instructional development independently on at least a limited basis. The faculty/client may also be expected to communicate his success to his colleagues. Thus, the shotgun approach results in significant institutional impact through the establishment of a network of independent faculty members utilizing instructional development to improve instruction. The efforts of a single instructional developer are multiplied many times as each new faculty is taught to use ID for the improvement of instruction.

RESULTS OF SHOTGUNNING

At institutions where shotgunning is practiced, the ID emphasis often is upon teaching the faculty member the ID process rather than upon merely turning out an instructional product. Every effort is made to render the ID activity as palatable as possible. Since it is important for the faculty member to achieve a success at the end of his ID effort, the product is not ignored. Varying amounts of ID staff support and participation are provided according to the aptitude and needs of the individual faculty/client. As faculty growth is perceived, ID staff support is withdrawn, until the faculty/client is operating solo. Follow-up support is provided to encourage the faculty/client to initiate independent ID projects. Follow-up includes statements of recognition and provision of material and consultative support.

In a review of the literature on ID, Durzo (1976) indicates that this imparting of ID skills to faculty is not a rare procedure. "The majority of opinions offered suggests that a major goal of any successful program should be for faculty to become instructional developers in their own right." Interestingly, some of the problems that plague the ID house may be attributed to trying to make developers out of faculty members. For example, to see how one sort of mischief began we need look only at the title of Faris' (1970) article, "Faculty Development — Key to Instructional Development." Notice two things here in particular: 1) Faris subordinated faculty development to instructional development, and 2) Faris was suggesting a way to increase the effect of ID procedures by multiplying the number of ID practitioners. Maybe it is too simple an explanation, but a retrospective view offers the conclusion that you must have a tail before it can be used to wag the dog. Faris may not have been the first to use the term faculty development, but he has the dubious distinction of having pinned it upon the backside of the ID dog.

A second unfortunate effect of the widespread practice of transforming faculty members into competent instructional developers has been to obscure the potential contributions of students to the spread of instructional development.

THE ROLE OF STUDENTS IN I D

The greatest untapped reservoirs of labor and talent in the world are the pools of students on college campuses. By-and-large the student population is comprised of young adults bored with trivia and make-work. These impatient people are eager to turn their efforts toward activities that count. They want to work on projects that will improve the world – even the academic world.

As pointed out earlier, the instructional developer, working alone, can barely begin to develop all of the instruction on campus. Faculty members who become adept can multiply that effort, but there are several reasons why the faculty cannot be expected to do too much – even after they become accomplished instructional developers in their own right. The major obstacle to massive faculty participation lies in the prior overcommitment of their time.

Braden (1977) enumerated several ways that students can become involved in the ID process. Both faculty members and instructional developers can recruit them. Pay and/or academic credit may be involved, but participation is as much reward as most students will require. Once involved, the student has several unique contributions to make to Instructional Development: 1) He/she can frequently approach a faculty member, suggesting a development project, when it would be inappropriate for a developer to do so. 2) The labor of the student, which traditionally is devoted to busy work, is a convertible asset which can be used to save time and money. 3) The student is often the best judge of courses and instructional materials that need improvement. 4) Some faculty members, who won't work with an instructional developer, will work with students. (It is a safer relationship for the faculty member because he/she remains unthreatened and in control.) 5) Because students have limited time for ID participation, they necessarily will become involved in small projects. Also, students' interests reach into every academic discipline. In combination, these factors suggest that students are a strong potential asset to be used in dealing with the need to shotgun in those environments where shotgunning is economically a poor ID strategy.

When students are pulled into the ID process they provide a middle link between the more traditional ID team members. The presence of the student in the ID team softens the question as to who does the work that a faculty member would otherwise need to do. This is a

major enticement to gain faculty involvement in an ID project. If permitted, the student can do part of the project work of the instructional developer. Also, the student can do part of the production work on a project that is normally costly in terms of technician wages. Yes, the student can do all of these things and in so doing speed progress on the project.

Students can be brought into the ID process whether shotgunning is the practice or not. In fact, intern developers can play a significant role in a rigorous anti-shotgun system. However, schools that do not have strong instructional technology *teaching programs* are unlikely to be able to sustain an internship program for budding instructional developers. This leads to the conclusion that the greatest potential for student participation in ID is in shotgun approaches. This in turn leads to the observation that in many environments the students and the faculty members will be learning to do ID together. As faculty members become adept at ID, the student ID helpers of the future will in many cases completely replace the instructional developers of today – but we need not despair at that prospect. There will always be new faculty entering the stream, and in most places there will be more to do than people to do it. The developers won't be out of business. They will be trying to decide who to serve first, and, if the excess demand is overpowering, they may be trying to decide who not to serve at all.

PRIORITIES

A critical set of decisions in the establishment of an ID program turns upon the concept of *priorities*. The question is, will one client's project be given preferential treatment over that of another client? There are good arguments in favor of either a positive or a negative answer. The setting of priorities is a cornerstone of the anti-shotgun approach. That does not mean, however, that first-come-first-serve, the antithesis of selection-by-priority, is the trademark of every shotgunner. Even those ID programs which attempt to serve every faculty member who calls or drops by can offer differential support as long as the factors for selection are consistently applied. For example, subsidies to be applied against the fee-for-services charges of a media production facility can be allocated at the discretion of the developer.

In general, the shotgun ID shop should eschew the setting of priorities. One of the strongest arguments in favor of a shotgun ID approach is that it has the potential to serve *all* faculty who desire to improve their instruction. Any program which can offer such wide-ranging support makes up in atmosphere-for-change for many other deficiences. By contrast, programs which threaten to stifle creative ideas through selection-rejection processes have a chilling effect on some faculty members.

Even so, the world is not perfect, and it may become necessary for the developer to control the flow of work with some sort of priority system. Imagine, for example, the dilemma that would strike a small ID operation if the president of the institution suddenly linked raises in salary to ID activity! While this is obviously an example from a frustrated developer's fantasy life, it is also a concession to the unpredictable nature of events. In the final analysis, budget, or sickness, or unpredicted success, or any of dozens of things might make the decision to impose priorities a viable choice for any developer. The shotgun developer, however, may *still* have greater flexibility in the matter of priorities than his anti-shotgun counterpart.

DIFFUSION OF THE ID CONCEPT

Given the fact that instructional development is worthwhile, it seems important to communicate to the educational community the nature of ID and its benefits. Instructional development, while it has great potential for the improvement of instruction, will never realize its potential until a significant portion of the educational community is aware of its existence. Since a large segment of the educational community is lamentably unaware of ID, it would seem that a high priority goal of instructional developers should be the promotion of ID among educators. Such promotion would, of course, be best served by clear statements about the nature of ID and its benefits.

One might ask, "what are the professional associations and the recognized leaders doing to promote Instructional Development?" Unfortunately, the response seems to be, "they are talking to themselves." Too much of the literature advocates a particular approach, and too little presses for diffusion of the process in all acceptable forms. Naturally forceful individuals advocate specific approaches to ID that have proven successful in their shops. Because these individuals are forceful, their ideas receive a great deal of attention. They have become the spokesmen for instructional development. The problem arises when the leaders attempt to convince other instructional developers of the efficacy of their approach rather than convince educators of the need for ID. The instructional development movement suffers because the most powerful voices are directed internally, almost totally excluding efforts for the diffusion of ID among the greater educational community. The obvious recommendation of the authors is that the organization should be encouraged to devote more of its energies to promoting the profession and less of its energies to elitism and the trappings of professionalism.

CONCLUSION

The authors have raised some sticky questions and have attempted to lend some clarity to the issues challenging instructional developers. On some issues the authors have taken strong positions that are counter to those of the acknowledged leaders in the field. However, the questions remain; no issues have been settled. It remains for instructional developers to remember the questions, to study the issues, and to take positions relevant to their situations. It is tempting to call for a concensus on the issues, but we must all realize that the contingencies of reality make consensus unlikely. In fact, consensus and rigid adherence to any party line is not really desirable.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Association for Educational Communications and Technology. *Educational technology: Definition and glossary of terms, Volume 1.* Washington D.C.: AECT, 1977.

Bergquist, W. H., and Phillips, S. R. *A handbook for faculty development.* Washington D.C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1975.

Bergquist, W. H., and Phillips, S. R. *A handbook for faculty development, Volume 2.* Washington D.C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1977.

Braden, R. A. *Instructional development questionnaire.* Fayetteville, Arkansas: University of Arkansas, 1973.

Braden, R. A. *A descriptive and interpretive study of instructional development programs in higher education.* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas) Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1974, No. 74-28, 131.

Braden, R. A. Some thoughts on students as bait to lure faculty into instructional development activity. Paper presented at the AECT Convention, Miami, 1977.

Davies, I. K., and Schwen, T. M. (eds.) Toward a definition of instructional development. *AECT Occasional Papers.* Washington D.C.: Division of Instructional Development of AECT, 1972.

Diamond, R. M., Eickmann, P. E., Kelly, E. F., Holloway, R. E., Vickery, T. R., and Pascarella, E. T. *instructional development for individualized learning in higher education.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications, 1975.

Durzo, J. J. Literature on instructional development: A summary of implications for implementing instructional development programs. *Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education,* 1976, *2* (2), 4–8.

Faris, G. Faculty development—the key to instructional development. In *Development—Significant response to education's problems.* Bloomington, Indiana: School of Education, Indiana University, 1970.

Gaff, J. G. *Toward faculty renewal.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Holsclaw, J. E. Procedural guidelines for the systematic design of instruction within higher education. *Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1975, *1*, 3–15.

Popham, W. J. Higher education's commitment to instructional development programs. Presented at international conference, *Improving University Teaching*, Amherst, Massachusetts, October 4–8, 1974.

Silber, K. H. From the president. *DID Newsletter*, 1977a, *8*(1), 2.

Silber, K. H. Personalizing instructional development. *Audiovisual Instruction*, 1977b, *22*(7), 52.